

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,440	07/26/2006	Rainer Sturmer	12810-00315-US	2707
23416 7590 02/12/2008 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP P O BOX 2207			EXAMINER	
			CHANDRAKUMAR, NIZAL S	
WILMINGTON, DE 19899		·	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/587,440	STURMER, RAINER				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Nizal S. Chandrakumar	1625				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	es have been received. Is have been received in Applications in the second in the sec	tion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summan	y (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Netericles Cited (PTO-032) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date				

Application/Control Number:

10/587,440 Art Unit: 1625

DETAILED ACTION

This application filed 07/26/2006 is a 371 of PCT/EP05/00420 01/18/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishio et al. (JP 02142495) further in view of Liu et al (Chirality 2000, 12, 26-29).

Instant Claims:

The instant claims are drawn to a process of making compound **D** according to the steps shown below:

Scope of the prior art:

Application/Control Number:

10/587,440 Art Unit: 1625

Nishio et al. teach optical resolution of racemic R1R2R3COH [R1-3 = H, halo, (halo- or amino-substituted) C1-20 aliphatic, aromatic hydrocarbon] using esterase wherein (R,S)-1-Phenylethanol [(R,S)-I] and succinic anhydride in Et2O were treated with Lipase B at 25° for 4 h (.apprx.50% conversion), the filtrate of the reaction mixture was mixed with aqueous Na2CO3, and the mixture was left to separate into an organic layer and an aqueous layer. The monoester Na salt in the aqueous layer was stirred with NaOH to give 96% (R)-I (96% ee), while unreacted (S) alcohol was isolated from the organic layer in 98% yield (94% ee).

Liu et al. teach the conversion of A to B, B to C and C to D. The method taught by Liu et al. for the conversion of A to B is the same as that of the instant application. The method taught by the Liu et al. for the conversion of C to D is the same as that of the instant application.

The difference:

Nishio et al. does not teach the resolution of compound **B** of the instant claims. Nsihio et al. also does not teach the conversion of **B** to **C** or **C** to **D**, which is taught by Liu et al.

Liu et al. does not teach the resolution of **B** to **C** using succinic anhydride. Liu et al uses vinylbutanate and lipase. The resolved products of Liu et al. are separated by chromatographic means, as such differs from the teachings Nishio et al. which uses acid-base extraction procedure.

Motivation:

Although Nishio does not teach the resolution of exact commercially important compound B or the exact lipase, the <u>method</u> of enzymatic resolution and isolation of the isolation of the succinic acid half ester of one of the antipodes by treatment with aqueous carbonate base and thus leaving other available for extraction into organic phase is identical. Since several lipases that hydrolyze esters, i.e., esterases, are available commercially, one skilled in the art attempting to improve the methods of Liu et al. to resolve racemic alcohol **B** would be motivated to use succinic anhydride in the place of vinyl acetate as per the

10/587,440 Art Unit: 1625

method of Nishio et al. because Nishio et al. teaches that resolved unhydrolysed half ester of succinic anhydride could be separated from the resolved alcohol by acid-base extraction procedure.

Prior art not relied upon:

Method for purification of alcohols using cyclic anhydrides Boaz, Neil W. US 5312950

Convenient practical resolution of racemic alkyl-aryl alcohols via enzymic acylation with succinic anhydride in organic solvents
Gutman, Arie L.; Brenner, Dov; Boltanski, Aviv
Tetrahedron: Asymmetry (1993), 4(5), 839-44.

Enzymic process for the stereoselective preparation of a hetero-bicyclic alcohol enantiomer. Buizer, Nicolaas; Kruse, Chris G.; van der Laan, Melle; Langrand, Georges; van Scharrenburg, Gustaaf J. M.; Snoek, Maria C. US 5914263.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nizal S. Chandrakumar whose telephone number is 571 272 6202. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30 AM - 4.30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Janet Andres can be reached on 5710272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this
application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:

10/587,440 Art Unit: 1625 Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative

or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-

1000.

Nizal S. Chandrakumar

MARGARET SEAMAN